An Angry Letter from Sen. Humphrey, P. 3

Why Ike Lost That Argument With Zhukov: Is Freedom Just Commercial? P. 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 30 JULY 29, 1957 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Senate Debate Through Negro Eyes

More important to the Negro than the right to vote is the right to live without humiliation. The right to vote in the one-party South, where rival Democratic candidates if any compete in appeals to racism, has been highly overrated in the Senate debates which are slowly destroying hopes of an effective civil rights bill. The right to sit down undisturbed in a bus after a hard day's work, the right to justice when short-changed or cheated, the right to have one's children begin to grow up without being treated as niggers or even (as the better white folks slur it) *nigras,* these are the rights, these are the every day agonies, these make the bitter bread of the black man's affliction. All this has been forgotten in the complacent discussions which paved the way for defeat of Part III, the human rights section of the civil rights bill, and may end in emasculating Part IV, its political rights section, with a jury trial amendment.

What No White Man Really Knows

What is missing from the debate is easily discernible. The Negro has his champions in the Senate but no spokesman. The massive researches of a Douglas of Illinois, the noble humanism of a Clark of Pennsylvania, the legal labors of a Javits of New York, are no substitute for a man who could speak as one who himself knows what it means to be born black. Amid the sterile legalisms and the courtly compliments what is missing are the realities only a Negro can know and only a Negro Senator could express. From the gallery, through the eyes of a Negro, there must be a constant anguish in the lily-white scene. The Senate appears not merely as an exclusive club but as a white man's club in which a younger group faces up reluctantly to the task of enacting regulations painful to some of its oldest members. Even through the speeches of those most devoted to the Negro's cause there runs a tone of supplication, apology and tenderness. Rarely has so much exquisite tact been expended on the oppressor by those who are supposed to be rescuing the oppressed.

Filibuster Outlawed In South

If little enough reality gets through on the Senate floor, even less of it is reported in the press. The South makes short shrift at home with all the ideals it parades in Washington. The filibuster it wields as its final weapon in the Senate is outlawed in its own State legislatures. A simple majority on a motion for the previous question is enough to shut off all debate in the State Senates of Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. Alabama and South Carolina have other forms of cloture. In the Southern, as indeed the Northern States, there is no jury trial for civil contempt and rarely even in criminal contempt. Fulbright smugly quotes Walter Lippmann on "the American idea . . . that important minorities must not be coerced" but lawless coercion of the Negro minority is the essence of that "way of life" the South is defending. Even while the South assails government by injunction on the Senate floor, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is being outlawed in the South by some of the most savagely repressive injunctions ever issued by the courts in this country. The American Jewish Congress, to its credit, has published a sober and documented study of this judicial reign of terror but little attention has been paid to it. Douglas read it into the Congressional Record after Russell blandly told McNamara he had "never heard" of laws against the NAACP.

That so feeble a spirit as Eisenhower should fumble and so slippery a politician as our Attorney General should choose this moment to vacation is not surprising. The desertion that hurts is that of such Senate liberals as Morse and O'Mahoney. Russell, one of the five conservative Southern Democrats who joined Morse to vote for the Hell's Canyon public power project, denied on CBS *Capital Cloakroom* [transcript in the July 10 Congressional Record] there was a deal "in any sense I know of. I hope, however, such a thing as appreciation still exists in the Senate. . . . I hope that the purpose of this charge will not frighten the true liberals in the Senate who will support, for example, a jury trial amendment."

Is Committee Procedure Sacred?

Sure enough at the most crucial moment for the Negro since Reconstruction, Morse grew emotional about "the end justifies the means doctrine adopted by those who have put the [civil rights] bill on the Senate calendar in violation of historic committee procedure and justice." He was for consigning the bill to Eastland. A subcommittee of Senate Judiciary had held hearings from February 14 to March 5; it had published them in a 950 page volume; it had discussed the identical bill sent over from the House; a majority report had been filed with the full Judiciary Committee on March 19 and a minority report by Ervin and Johnston on May 10. Hennings, the chairman of that subcommittee, had complained bitterly to the Senate on June 20 that Eastland was keeping the bill and the report bottled up. But here weeks later was Morse asserting that there had been no committee hearings or report. When Pastore of Rhode Island asked him why Eastland could not have brought in a report during the last few weeks of civil rights debate, Morse replied "Human nature, just human nature." Of all the bitter scenes in this Senate, the worst for the Negro was to see a Morse scratching an Eastland's back.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trujillo Buys Himself A Positively Impartial Investigation for Only $160,000

Why Eisenhower Lost That War-Time Ideological Debate With Zhukov

We were fascinated by Eisenhower's account of his wartime ideological bull sessions with Zhukov. The President said "I was very hard put to it when he insisted that their system appealed to the idealistic, and we completely to the materialistic." It is indicative that the only freedoms Eisenhower stressed, as he recalls it, were commercial: "a man can earn what he pleases, save what he pleases, buy what he pleases." Nowhere did the President mention the right to think as one pleases. Eisenhower saw freedom in business men's terms, the freedom of the market place. Limited to those terms, the system is wide open to Zhukov's reproach in the classic socialist-communist tradition, "Everything that is selfish in man you appeal to him. . . ."

Ideologically Ike was as ill-prepared and naive as the average G. I. His account of the conversation is in striking accord with the portrait drawn by a writer in the summer issue of the quarterly *Dissent*, summarizing the findings of the research branch of the U. S. Army in its volumes on *The American Soldier* in World War II: "The American soldier emerges from this collective portrait as a man without serious commitment. He fought because he *had* to; meanwhile he looked out for himself as much as he could. The resistance to ideology, stemming partly from the American dream of individual success which not even the depression had been able to destroy, was now reenforced by military experience. Soldiers fighting for democracy found themselves serving under a tremendously authoritarian military caste which they justifiably despised."

The only effective answer to Zhukov was that communism in practice had become, not a brotherly society working for the common good, but an authoritarian hierarchical system run by a bureaucratic caste, on the basis of unquestioning obedience by subordinates. But these are also the characteristics of armies.

It is not surprising that a professional soldier like Eisenhower failed to criticize communism effectively for habits of regimentation he had been trained all his life long to accept as virtues. The civilian ideals he defended were abstractions with which he had too little experience. Even now, years later, as President, the freedom that comes at once to the surface of his mind when he is asked to answer a question "off the cuff" at press conference is the freedom to make money. This is, indeed, the only Magna Charta capitalism prizes; the rest is tolerated as oratorical eye-wash.

Impartial at $50,000 Per

We are shocked by the dubious ethics and bad taste shown by Morris Ernst in accepting a $50,000 fee from a public relations firm representing the Trujillo dictatorship in Santo Domingo to conduct a supposedly impartial investigation of the Galindez disappearance and the Murphy murder. A distinguished anti-Fascist scholar and exile was kidnapped on American soil 16 months ago and has disappeared; the American pilot who flew him out has been murdered; a second pilot arrested by the Dominican government under pressure from the State Department is said to have committed suicide in jail and left a note confessing Murphy's murder. But the handwriting of the purported confession turned out not to match that of the man supposed to have written it.

Thus we have here a series of crimes, in part committed on American and in part on Dominican soil. The Trujillo government protests its innocence but has refused to cooperate with the investigations by the New York police department and the State and Justice departments. Instead Trujillo has signed a $160,000 contract with a Tammany Hall publicity man, Sydney S. Baron, to bring about "a generally better understanding" of his regime. Baron has hired Ernst and a former New York State Judge at $50,000 each and $50,000 expenses to investigate. The investigating group will set up offices in the Baron publicity firm "and the two will work together closely, according to Mr. Baron."

The Dominican Ambassador announces that his government "has waived all power of censorship" over the report to be made by Ernst and Ernst says that in case of lack of cooperation by the Dominican authorities he will withdraw. But Ernst adds that if he withdraws he will "preserve professional confidence and refrain from issuing any report." This is how one fulfills a private relationship, not a public duty. It means that if Ernst ever gets too close to where the bodies are buried for Trujillo's comfort, the whole thing can be called off and Ernst will keep mum.

Any day now we expect to hear that Jimmy Hoffa has hired a public relations firm and a liberal lawyer to investigate him, too.

Add Krushchev v. Malenkov

"The bloody tangle of the 'Leningrad Affair,' with its secret purges and counter-purges, can hardly be unravelled by anyone without access to the archives of the Soviet political police. As to Malenkov's alleged responsibility for Voznessensky's fate, Krushchev's latest version conflicts with an earlier account he himself has given to Eastern European Communists. In that earlier version he related that he, Malenkov, and Bulganin had jointly tried to save Voznessensky's life. . . . They interceded with Stalin, pleading that Voznessensky was innocent. . . . One of Krushchev's own accounts of Malenkov's role in this matter must be false."

—Isaac Deutscher, biographer of Stalin, writing in the London Times, July 11, on the new purge.

Youngdahl's Historic Words Condemning the Internal Security Committee

"The Senate Internal Security subcommittee conducted investigations which were indistinguishable from those the Supreme Court condemned. In addition, the particular series of hearings here involved constituted an even more serious threat to freedom of thought and expression. For these hearings consisted of the questioning of persons employed in the newspaper field, in radio and television. . . .

"In Watkins, the Supreme Court found that the authorizing resolution of the Un-American Activities Committee is of 'confusing breadth and that its boundaries are so nebulous' that it is impossible for courts to determine when the Committee has exceeded its authority. . . . The vices to be found in the House Un-American Activities Committee's authorizing resolution are equally present in the charter of the Senate Internal Security subcommittee . . .[which] purports to grant the authority to investigate 'subversive activities.' . . .

"What is the height of orthodoxy today may be viewed as 'un-American' tomorrow. Nor is there any individual who can be certain that he is not considered 'subversive' by some of his fellow citizens. Who is to say, for example, whether one who is openly dedicated to depriving his neighbors of their 14th Amendment rights under the Federal Constitution is a subversive? The dangers of classifying certain forms of belief or political activity as 'subversive' are all too apparent from the recent history of this country."

—Judge Youngdahl, acquitting Seymour Peck

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Letter of Protest and A Reply: How An ADA Senator Served as Foil for the FBI

Some All Too Recent History Senator Humphrey Would Rather Forget

Senator Humphrey is one of the ablest and most hard-working members of the Senate, a liberal to whom we have been grateful on many issues. But we have been critical of him on security matters. The angry letter from the Senator which we published at the bottom of this page seems to us —with all due respect—a pretty vague reply to our July 1 issue. We there discussed the report made by the Commission on Government Security and the curious role Senator Humphrey played in creating that commission.

The facts are easily ascertainable. In 1955 the Ladejinsky and Chasanow scandals, the Matusow recantation, and the perjuries which turned up in the testimony of so many of the FBI's confidential informants had aroused the public to security-loyalty abuses. The Democratic leadership was angered by the unscrupulous manipulation of statistics by Attorney General Brownell and other Republicans in discussing the loyalty of government employes. Their figures had become a "numbers game."

The Right Was Alarmed

The Democrats were back in control of Congress. The stage was set for corrective legislation. Johnston of South Carolina had just submitted a resolution for a full scale Senate investigation. The Right was alarmed (see the *Weekly* of March 21, 1955 for details). At that moment Senator Humphrey put in S. J. Res. 21 for the creation of a 12-man Commission on Government Security.

Since four men were to be picked by the White House and four by the Republican leadership in Congress, it was obvious that this Commission would be stacked by the G.O.P. 8-to-4 and could be used to whitewash security-loyalty abuses. It was significant that neither Morse nor Lehman, Humphrey's two fellow vice chairmen of ADA (Americans for Democratic Action), joined Humphrey in sponsoring this resolution. The only co-sponsor he could obtain was Stennis of Mississippi.

Why Mundt Applauded

In his letter, Senator Humphrey says his report to the Senate on this resolution "speaks for itself." Indeed, it does. It explains why Senator Mundt, co-author of the Mundt-Nixon bill which became the Internal Security Act and set up the Subversive Activities Control Board, rose to say that he was "unreservedly" a strong supporter of the Humphrey resolution.

For in that report to the Senate, Humphrey indicated that his resolution contained provisions which would protect secret practices from full study by the Commission. He pointed out that under Section 8 no agency could be required to furnish the Commission with information which might "jeopardize intelligence or investigative functions." This followed, Senator Humphrey explained, from "the unquestionable necessity for protecting the FBI's methods and devices" for surveillance. These include wire-tapping, "bugging," mail covers and a network of political informers.

Only Casual Informants

Senator Humphrey also made it clear that in his view there should be no right to confront these informers when they were regularly employed undercover men, though some of the most famous of these had turned out to be alcoholics, psychopaths or mercenaries. He thought the Commission, in considering the problem of confrontation, should do so "strictly in terms of casual informants."

As it turned out, these built-in safeguards were unnecessary. Not a single liberal was appointed to that 12-man Commission. Its existence served to sidetrack the critical recommendations made by the Johnston Committee. The Commission worked 18 months in secret, under the direction of two former assistants to J. Edgar Hoover, and its conclusions were about what might have been expected. We will not repeat our analysis of them here. Now readers can have a copy of the July 1 issue on request, and compare for themselves our exposure of the Commission's phony claims with Senator Humphrey's significantly vague protest.

Add Confidential Informants

On July 16, without debate, the House passed a bill to pay Michael S. Tillimon of Toledo, Ohio, $2,000 for damages incident to his false imprisonment by the FBI on a charge of cashing stolen travellers' checks. He was arrested Dec. 23, 1955, but ordered released two months later by Federal Judge Kent in Michigan after a witness who had identified Tillimon as the check cashier admitted he had made a mistake.

When this bill (HR 6166) reaches the Senate, will some liberal Senator point out that such an injustice could never have been corrected if this had been a security case, if Tillimon had been a government employe and if the witness against him had been one of those confidential informants the FBI shields from confrontation?

Senator Humphrey's Angry Reply to Charges in Our Issue of July 1

"Dear Mr. Stone: I have read your publication for July 1. I refer in particular to page one concerning the report of the Commission on Government Security. I trust the balance of your bulletin is more accurate than its introductory paragraph.

"I am sure you know that some of your observations are inaccurate. First, the resolution that I introduced to establish a Commission on Government Security did not prevent a Congressional investigation. The investigation was made, first, by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under the chairmanship of Senator Johnston. The latter investigation was very extensive and complete. The report was highly critical of the government security program.

"My own activities in this field are a matter of record. My report to the Senate at the time we considered the passage of the bill to establish the Commission speaks for itself.

"The Commission did consist of 12 members—six Democrats and Six Republicans — four appointed by the Vice President, four by the speaker of the House, but in each instance the presiding officer merely performed the function of appointing those Senators and House members who had previously been selected by the respective Majority and Minority leaders. In the instance of the Senate, the Vice President, to be sure, did perform the official act of appointing four Senators, but two Democrats were selected by the Democratic Policy Committee through the Majority Leader, and the two Republicans by the Republican Committee through its Minority Leader.

"Now, you know the facts of life about Congressional appointments. So why try to mislead your readers?

"While I do not agree with many of the observations of the Commission, it is fair to say that several of the recommendations were highly critical of the loyalty-security program. Furthermore, some sound suggestions for improvement were made. I consider the report to be helpful, despite its obvious limitations.

"I do not consider your comments to be at all helpful. They exhibit prejudice, lack of intimate knowledge of the report, and preconceived notions of what is right or wrong. You have gone out of your way to emphasize those portions of the report which are highly controversial and less desirable."

Sincerely yours, Hubert H. Humphrey.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is Selling Diseased Poultry A Basic Liberty? White House Shields Dollar-A-Year Men

Germans Overwhelmingly Against Nuclear Arms for Their Army

Diseased Poultry: One-third of food poisoning cases each year are due to diseased poultry and 26 poultry diseases are communicable to humans. Thanks to a long campaign by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers Union, both houses of Congress have finally passed a bill for compulsory inspection of poultry packing, now a big business. Most ludicrous moment in the House debate came when Clare Hoffman of Michigan, the least modern of Republicans, quoted the Declaration of Independence against poultry inspection.

Nuclear War: According to a German public opinion poll (London *Times,* July 9) three fourths of the population of West Germany is against the equipping of the new German army with nuclear weapons and the storing of these weapons by allied forces on German soil. . . . France's High Commissioner for Atomic Energy, in an article for *L'Express,* has protested the use of the term "clean" in connection with atom bombs as a shocking device to diminish "justified anguish of peoples facing atomic war." . . . Silliest aftermath of the recent civil defense exercises (New York alone had 2,339,012 "killed" and 2,261,238 "wounded") was a New York *Daily News* editorial demanding similar statistics on "what we did to *them.*"

Peace-Time Dollar-A-Year Men: Despite all that campaign talk of ending corruption in government, the "modern" GOP White House used the troglodyte Hoffman in a covert but unsuccessful attempt to block passage in the House of the first bill (HR 7390) to regulate the business men's "advisory committees," with which the government now swarms. The debate showed there are some 35,000 committees of this kind attached to the government, a shadow "state within a state." Fountain of North Carolina cited a series of scandals in Agriculture where "advisory committees" took advantage of their inside position. In one case a seed advisory committee formed a syndicate which bought for less than $2,000,000 seed which had cost the government $6,000,000. Celler of New York, who has waged a long campaign against these evils, charged that in oil matters the government is a mere rubber stamp for the private advisory committees. The bill will probably die in the Senate since the Administration is strongly opposed even to this first weak measure of regulation.

Words Which Would Doom Mankind

"We do not propose to eliminate nuclear weapons or the possibility of their use. . . ."

—Dulles Broadcast on Disarmament, July 21

Mote in Our Own Eye: Jovito Villalba, who would probably be President of Venezuela today if its dictator, Jimenez, the oil company favorite, had not voided the 1952 elections published a letter in the *Washington Post* July 11 students of Latin American affairs should not miss. "A few months ago," Villalba wrote, "Henry Cabot Lodge said in the United Nations that wherever Russia arrives, liberty disappears. Venezuela is the country where the presence of the United States is most evident and at the same time the one in which liberty is most absent."

IFS on Nightbeat: Our thanks to the many readers who telegraphed, wrote or told us personally how much they enjoyed our appearance on "Nightbeat," the New York TV program by John Wingate, Thursday, July 18. We feel that we succeeded in saying boldly and forcefully what countless others wish they could say to Congressional and other investigators. Those Americans who wonder at the spectacle of intellectuals in China called on to "repent" their criticism of the regime may pause and consider that this is exactly what the witch hunters ask of dissenters in this country. I don't know why either Mr. Wingate or any TV viewer should have been surprised by it but I did not "repent" any cause I have ever supported. Remark which seemed to please the audience most (when asked about the references to me in the Senate Internal Security Committee's "Handbook for Americans"): "They're just a bunch of nuts, and I mean nuts." I was happy to be able to put in simple bar-room language the obvious fact that these witch hunt documents are the product of paranoid minds, wacky members of Congress buttressed by wackier ex-Reds who use the *Daily Worker* as their Bible-in-reverse. I hope I have encouraged others to take heart and speak up, too.

If You're Not Already A Subscriber, You Can Have the Weekly 6 Months On Trial for Only $2

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

7/29/57

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington. D. C., under the Act of March 3. 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington 15, D. C.
An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone: Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED